



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,169	02/19/2004	Shane D. Pannell	2230.0003	7168
84278	7590	07/22/2009		
Robert D. Atkins 605 W. Knox Road, Suite 104 Tempe, AZ 85284			EXAMINER KIM, CHRISTOPHER S	
			ART UNIT 3752	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/22/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* SHANE D. PANNELL and MICHAEL K. WRIGLEY

---

Appeal 2009-003415  
Application 10/783,169  
Technology Center 3700

---

Decided:<sup>1</sup> July 22, 2009

---

Before LINDA E. HORNER, STEVEN D.A. McCARTHY  
and FRED A. SILVERBERG, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

McCARTHY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

---

<sup>1</sup> The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304 (2008), begins to run from the Decided Date shown on this page of the decision. The time period does not run from the Mail Date (paper delivery) or the Notification Date (electronic delivery).

The Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from the Examiner's decision finally rejecting claims 74-89 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 (2002) as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 (2002) as being indefinite. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

We REVERSE.

Claim 74 is typical of the claims on appeal:

74. A chemical distribution system, comprising:  
a residential home;  
a yard in an exposed area adjacent to the residential home including a fence, gate, shrub, tree, swimming pool, patio, garden, grass area, play area, and concrete pad;  
a hollow tubing disposed around each of a plurality of target areas in the yard including the fence, shrub, tree, garden, and grass area, the tubing transporting a chemical solution selected from the group consisting of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, animal retardants, and vegetation pre-emergence, the tubing being made of a chemical resistant material selected from the group consisting of polyethylene, polyurethane, nylon, and polypropylene, with a pressure rating of at least sixty pounds per square inch, the tubing having an inside diameter ranging from one-eighth inch to three-fourth inch and an outside diameter ranging from one-fourth inch to one inch, *the tubing having a plurality of openings cut through its wall structure at selected points in accordance with government regulations and manufacturer's recommendations* and corresponding to each of the plurality of target areas, the tubing including a plurality of "Y" and elbow couplings for changing

1 direction of the tubing to cover the plurality of  
2 target areas, the tubing being routed up and down  
3 *structures* that extend vertically above ground  
4 secured with pressure-fit clamps and otherwise laid  
5 above ground;

6 a plurality of spray nozzles inserted into the  
7 openings in the tubing for distributing the chemical  
8 solution to the selected target areas, the spray  
9 nozzles being circular in shape, made of non-  
10 corrosive metal and having adjustable flow rates  
11 and spray patterns;

12 a truck for transporting the chemical  
13 solution to the residential home, the truck  
14 including a hose for transporting the chemical  
15 solution to the tubing;

16 first and second junction boxes disposed  
17 below ground in a front area of the residential  
18 home;

19 a first pressure regulator connected to the  
20 tubing within the first junction box for regulating  
21 pressure of the chemical solution;

22 a first hook-up port disposed within the first  
23 junction box and having an output connected to a  
24 first end of the tubing, the first hook-up port  
25 including a lever arm which lays horizontal within  
26 the junction box when not in use and rotates ninety  
27 degrees to a vertical position so that a fitting on an  
28 end of the lever arm extends above ground when  
29 connected to the hose from the truck;

30 a second hook-up port disposed within the  
31 second junction box and having an output  
32 connected to a second end of the tubing, the  
33 second hook-up port including a lever arm which  
34 lays horizontal within the junction box when not in  
35 use and rotates ninety degrees to a vertical position  
36 so that a fitting on an end of the lever arm extends  
37 above ground when connected to the hose from the  
38 truck, wherein the first and second hook-up ports

1 form a closed system to equalize pressure and  
2 distribution of the chemical solution;  
3 a second pressure regulator coupled in a  
4 portion of the tubing which is located in a rear  
5 portion of the yard for regulating pressure of the  
6 chemical solution; and  
7 a booster pump coupled in a portion of the  
8 tubing which is located in the rear portion of the  
9 yard for increasing the pressure of the chemical  
10 solution.  
11

12 [Emphasis added.] Independent claims 78 and 84 each recite “the tubing  
13 having a plurality of openings cut through a first portion of its wall structure  
14 in accordance with government regulations and manufacturer’s  
15 recommendations.”

16 The Examiner objects to the drawings. The Appellants seek to appeal  
17 this objection. (Br. 13 and 16-18.) Objections to the drawings are  
18 reviewable by petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181. (*See* MANUAL OF PATENT  
19 EXAMINATION PROCEDURE §§ 1002 and 1201.) The Board does not exercise  
20 jurisdiction over matters reviewable by petition. *In re Mindick*, 371 F.2d  
21 892, 894 (CCPA 1967).

22 The Examiner concludes that claims 74, 78 and 84 are indefinite  
23 because the Specification fails to identify the government regulations and  
24 manufacturer’s recommendations with which the plurality of openings cut  
25 through the wall structure of the hose must be in accord. (Ans. 5.) In  
26 addition, the Examiner concludes that claims 74, 78 and 84 are indefinite  
27 because the recited government regulations and manufacturer’s  
28 recommendations are subject to change during the life of any patent granted  
29 on the underlying application. (*Id.*) The Appellants contend that the term

1 “government regulations and manufacturer’s recommendations” is not  
2 indefinite because the term must be interpreted as of the filing date and  
3 because the relevant regulations and recommendations existing as of the  
4 filing date can be readily determined. (Br. 21.) Therefore, one issue raised  
5 by this appeal is:

6 Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in  
7 concluding that claims 74, 78 and 84 are indefinite because the  
8 Specification fails to identify the government regulations and  
9 manufacturer’s recommendations with which the plurality of  
10 openings cut through the wall structure of the hose must be in  
11 accord; or because those government regulations and  
12 manufacturer’s recommendations might change?

13 The language of a claim satisfies § 112, ¶ 2 if “one skilled in the art  
14 would understand the bounds of the claim when read in light of the  
15 specification.” *Exxon Research & Eng’g Co. v. United States*, 265 F.3d  
16 1371, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001). A claim is indefinite if the language of the  
17 claim is susceptible of no reasonable interpretation. *Id.* A claim under  
18 examination susceptible of more than one reasonable interpretation may be  
19 indefinite if the scope of the claim differs significantly depending on which  
20 of the reasonable interpretations one adopts. *Ex Parte Miyazaki*, 89  
21 USPQ2d 1207, 1211-12 (BPAI 2008).

22 The term “manufacturer’s recommendations” recited in claims 74, 78  
23 and 84 is limited to the chemical solution manufacturer’s recommendations.  
24 The Appellants’ Specification states that:

25 A spray nozzle or outlet 58 is inserted into  
26 each hole of tubing 50 along foundation wall 52  
27 for dispensing and applying the chemical pesticide

1 to the open target areas proximate to building  
2 structure 12 along foundation wall 52. . . . The  
3 selected locations for punch holes depend upon the  
4 pesticide manufacturer's recommended application  
5 instructions and any external structures 36 adjacent  
6 to or in proximity of foundation wall 52 that could  
7 interfere with the spraying pattern or otherwise  
8 unnecessarily be exposed to the chemical  
9 pesticide. The spray nozzles 58 are inserted into  
10 tubing 50 along foundation wall 52 for an even,  
11 complete, and directed coverage of the chemical  
12 pesticide to the outside ground areas proximate to  
13 building structure 12, in accordance with  
14 government regulations and manufacturer's  
15 recommendations.

16 (Spec. 8, ¶ 00017; *see also id.* 10, ¶ [00021].) The Specification's consistent  
17 use of the term "manufacturer's recommendations" in contexts implying that  
18 the recommendations are those of the chemical solution manufacturer  
19 similarly limit the term "manufacturer's recommendations" as used in claims  
20 74, 78 and 84.

21 In addition, the term "in accordance with government regulations and  
22 manufacturer's recommendations" will be limited to those regulations and  
23 recommendations applicable to the distribution of a particular chemical  
24 solution. To interpret the term more broadly would render the term  
25 superfluous, since any arrangement of openings in the wall of the tubing  
26 would be trivially in accordance with any *inapplicable* regulation or  
27 recommendation. For similar reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would  
28 understand the term "government regulations" to be limited to the  
29 regulations in force in the jurisdiction where the chemical distribution  
30 systems recited in claims 74, 78 or 84 are to be used.

Claim language is to be interpreted as it would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Ordinarily, this implies that claim language is to be interpreted as it would be understood as of the effective filing date. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (en banc). Likewise, definiteness under § 112, ¶ 2 is determined as of the filing date. *W.L. Gore & Assoc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1556 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, the “government regulations and manufacturer’s recommendations” recited in claims 74, 78 and 84 are the government regulations and manufacturer’s recommendations in effect as of the filing date. Any possibility that the regulations or recommendations might have changed subsequent to the filing date or may change in the future has no bearing on the scope or definiteness of claims 74, 78 and 84.

The Appellants are correct in asserting that the government regulations, and the chemical solution manufacturer’s recommendations, applicable to the distribution of a particular chemical solution in a particular jurisdiction as of the filing date of the application would have been readily ascertainable. In addition, the government regulations and the chemical solution manufacturer’s recommendations would have been reasonably pertinent to the problem of distributing the chemical solution and, as such, within the relevant prior art known to one of ordinary skill in the art. *Cf. In re GPAC*, 57 F.3d 1573, 1577 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (defining the “relevant prior art” to include art “reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved”); *id.*, 57 F.3d at 1579 (defining one of ordinary skill in the art as a “hypothetical person who is presumed to know the relevant prior art.”). Indeed, a prudent building contractor or a prudent



1 chemical solution distribution contractor likely would inquire into the  
2 applicable government regulations and manufacturer's recommendations  
3 before making or using a system such as that recited in claim 74, 78 or 84  
4 even absent a need to interpret those claims. In other words, one of ordinary  
5 skill in the art would have a reasonable understanding of the scope and  
6 meaning of the term "in accordance with government regulations and  
7 manufacturer's recommendations."

8 Claim language need only be as accurate as the claimed subject matter  
9 permits. *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565,  
10 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Since the chemical distribution systems recited in  
11 claims 74, 78 and 84 may be constructed in various jurisdictions subject to  
12 various government regulatory schemes, and since the systems may be used  
13 to distribute many types of chemical solutions subject to different  
14 manufacturer's recommendations, the recitation that the tubing is to have a  
15 plurality of openings "in accordance with government regulations and  
16 manufacturer's recommendations" is as accurate as the subject matter  
17 permits.

18 Therefore, the Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in  
19 concluding that claims 74, 78 and 84 are indefinite because the Specification  
20 fails to identify the government regulations and manufacturer's  
21 recommendations with which the plurality of openings cut through the wall  
22 structure of the hose must be in accord; or because those government  
23 regulations and manufacturer's recommendations might change.

24 The Examiner also concludes that the recitation in claim 74 that the  
25 tubing includes "a plurality of 'Y' and elbow couplings for changing  
26 direction of the tubing to cover the plurality of target areas, the tubing being

1 routed up and down *structures* that extend vertically above ground secured  
2 with pressure-fit clamps and otherwise laid above ground” [emphasis added]  
3 is indefinite because the term “structures” appears to be a double inclusion  
4 of the previously-recited residential home. (Ans. 3.) The Appellants  
5 contend that the term “structures” could refer to a fence or stakes and is not  
6 limited to the residential home. (Br. 22.) Therefore, another issue raised by  
7 this appeal is:

8                     Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in  
9                     concluding that claim 74 is indefinite because the term  
10                    “structures” as used in claim 74 is a double inclusion of the  
11                    previously-recited residential home?

12             Double inclusion, that is, the recitation of the same structure twice in a  
13 claim using different terminology, does not render a claim indefinite *per se*.  
14 *In re Kelley*, 305 F.2d 909, 916 (CCPA 1962). Even so, the term  
15 “structures” as used in claim 74 is not a double inclusion of the residential  
16 home. The recitation of the term “structures” in the plural indicates that the  
17 Appellants did not intend to limit the term to the residential home. The  
18 Appellants use the similar term “external structures” in the Specification to  
19 refer not only to the residential home 12, but also, for example, to the fence  
20 16, the gate 18, the shrubs 20 and the tree 22. (*See, e.g.*, Spec. 5, ¶ 00012.)  
21 In view of this usage, the term “structures” is broad, encompassing far more  
22 than merely the residential home.

23             The Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in concluding that  
24 claim 74 is indefinite because the term “structures” as used in claim 74 is a  
25 double inclusion of the previously-recited residential home. Therefore, the

Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims 74, 78 and 84, and their dependent claims, under § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite.

The Examiner concludes that the Specification fails to enable claims 74, 78 and 84 because the Specification fails to identify the government regulations and manufacturer's recommendations with which the plurality of openings cut through the wall structure of the hose must be in accord. (Ans. 3.) The Appellants contend that the Specification enables claims 74, 78 and 84 because one of ordinary skill in the art "would easily understand how to ascertain the relevant government regulations and manufacturer's recommendations." (Br. 18.) Therefore, a final issue raised by this appeal is:

Have the Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in concluding that the subject matter of claims 74, 78 and 84 is not enabled because the Specification fails to identify the government regulations and manufacturer's recommendations with which the plurality of openings cut through the wall structure of the hose must be in accord?

Our reviewing court has described the enablement requirement as follows:

Enablement is a legal determination of whether a patent enables one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention[;] is not precluded even if some experimentation is necessary, although the amount of experimentation needed must not be duly extensive[;] and is determined as of the filing date of the patent application. . . . Furthermore, a patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art.

1 *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384 (Fed.  
2 Cir. 1986) (citations omitted).

3 As discussed above, the applicable government regulations and  
4 manufacturer's recommendations would have been readily ascertainable;  
5 would have been reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which  
6 the Appellants were involved; and consequently would have been known to  
7 the hypothetical one of ordinary skill in the art. As such, the Appellants in  
8 the context of the present application were not required to identify or  
9 reproduce particular government regulations or manufacturer's  
10 recommendations in the Specification in order to enable claims 74, 78 and  
11 84.

12 Therefore, the Appellants have shown that the Examiner erred in  
13 concluding that the subject matter of claims 74, 78 and 84 is not enabled  
14 because the Specification fails to identify the government regulations and  
15 manufacturer's recommendations with which the plurality of openings cut  
16 through the wall structure of the hose must be in accord. The Appellants  
17 have shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting independent claims 74, 78  
18 and 84, along with their dependent claims, under § 112, ¶ 1 for failing to  
19 comply with the enablement requirement.

20  
21 **DECISION**

22 We REVERSE the Examiner's decision rejecting claims 74-89.  
23

24 **REVERSED**  
25  
26

Appeal 2009-003415  
Application 10/783,169

1 mls

2

ROBERT D. ATKINS  
605 W. KNOX ROAD, SUITE 104  
TEMPE, AZ 85284